

Christianity appear to be very different from what they were before. To-day he gave a brief account of what he saw in America to the church full of people.

He described the state of the arts as being far in advance of the arts in Persia—said, (as a reason for this,) they have the Bible there and read it; it is all from the Bible.

This account of the state of the arts was such as to fill his hearers with wonder. His remarks respecting the state of religion were still more interesting. He spoke of the great congregations assembled on the Sabbath, their devout attention, their stillness, the neatness and elegance of the churches. He said that in large churches, which would hold several thousand people, dirt enough could not be found to fill a pipe. The stillness of the Sabbath surprised him. He said, (in his general way of speaking,) that not a man was to be seen out on that day, except when on the way to the house of God.

CHRISTIAN REFLECTOR.

BOSTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

TERMS—\$2.50 per year; \$2 if paid within 3 months.

PRIZE ARTICLES.

We here announce the themes for three more prize articles; the first of which must be forwarded to us by the 15th of August. The second and third must be forwarded by the 15th of the succeeding months, September, and October. For the one adjudged by the Committee, in each case, to be the best, we shall pay TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS!

The themes we announce are of a popular and interesting character; and yet such as we should not expect able writers would thoroughly investigate and discuss, without the prospect of pecuniary compensation. They are as follows:

1. *The prospects which the present age presents to the cause of Religious Freedom.*

2. *The relation of Christianity to Politics.*

3. *The motives which should induce citizens of the South to make efforts for the abolition of slavery.*

The names of writers, in every instance, to be enclosed in a separate envelope, not to be opened till it is decided for which article the prize shall be awarded; and the articles all to be committed to the editor's care, to be returned by him, or retained for publication.

SLAVERY, A MORAL EVIL.

A letter has recently been addressed to the Rev. RICHARD FULLER, of South Carolina, through the Charleston Courier, the purport of which is contained in the following paragraph.

"For some time past, many of your brethren and friends in this section of the State, have been pained at learning the existence of a report which they believe to be unfounded, to wit: that while attending the late Baptist Convention held in Philadelphia, you pronounced slavery to be a moral evil, and stated that, regarding it as such, you deeply regretted its existence."

To this Mr. Fuller replies at some length, asserting that the report is not true, and maintaining that slavery is a *calamity*, but not a *sin*.—*See our account of the Convention*. He says, "I have been denounced by him, as both visionary and wicked; although he does not doubt that this class of men are conscientious. But he says, 'All assassins of the peace of society have been conscientious.' 'O liberty,' exclaimed one of the victims of the French revolution, 'how many crimes have been committed in thy name!' So we may say of conscience, 'Conscientious' as if conscience must not be disciplined by the precepts of God; and, as if in most men, conscience were anything more than a bundle of passions tied together."

When we see men defending a system like that of American slavery—defending it conscientiously, and from the Bible, as if God, in his own providence, had made it a necessary evil, and thus a *calamity*, which to attempt to remove is both visionary and wicked, we are strongly impressed with the very sentiment above quoted from the pen of Mr. Fuller. We feel that there are consciences entirely subject to the interest, and the passions; and that there are judgments, which neither splendid talents, classical learning, extensive observation, nor even an intimate acquaintance with the word of God, have been competent to save from the most unhappy perversion. If there be anything that makes us sad, and tends to dishearten us in the cause of freedom and of truth, it is this almost omnipotent power of self-interest and long cherished prejudices over the reason and conscience. Mr. Fuller, says, 'A moral evil is a sin, and my being a master is sufficient evidence of my opinion on that point.' Does not this fact furnish, not only the evidence of his opinion, but the reason of it? Would Mr. F.'s opinion be the same, if he were not a master, and were a resident of a free State? In the case of the slave-holder, the 'why and wherefore' of his defence of the system so odious to the rest of the world, and so obviously wicked, appear at once. All, who have studied human nature, recognize the influences which have operated to disqualify him for the perception of truth on this subject. It is for this reason, that we ought to cherish for the master feelings of fraternal sympathy. Were we born to his patrimony, and were our interests identified with the continuance of the system as we might be equally indisposed to perceiving the right—equally indisposed to admit the wrong.

But the question instantly arises, are the friends and advocates of emancipation as obviously under the influence of self-interest and passion, as are slave-holders? Does it become a slave-holder, though he be an eminent divine and preacher, to intimate that the thousands of educated ministers, and the tens of thousands of intelligent church members and citizens, who conscientiously believe slavery to be a moral evil, and that it is their duty to oppose it, have consciences not disciplined by the precepts of God; or nothing more than 'a bundle of passions tied together'? What should their motive be, for thinking thus and speaking thus concerning slavery? To select one instance out of thousands, what should induce the Rev. Dr. Welch, at the late meeting in Philadelphia, to declare before that great Convention his solemn conviction, that slavery is a physical evil, a social evil, a moral evil, evil, and evil continually? Now, we can well understand why Mr. Fuller should deem it only a calamity, and attempt a defence of it from the

Bible; but we cannot see what 'passions,' interests, or prejudices, on the part of Dr. Welch, could be gratified or favored by the course he now takes to pursue. And what it is that renders Northern men generally so slow to comprehend the 'precepts of God,'—what it is that so perverts their consciences and inflames their passions, on the subject of slavery, cool headed and intelligent as they mostly are, we cannot perceive. The evils of the system are not slightly felt by us, and if the Bible, God, and humanity, are on the side of slavery, how strange it is that we, who have nothing to lose by the discovery, should be unable to see it!

Mr. Fuller says,—"That slavery, like poverty, is a calamity, who will deny? And if it is a new question about reducing to bondage a free people, who would not oppose it? It is certain, too, that the introduction of African slavery into the colonies, was the work of English and Northern cupidity, in spite of the wishes and protestations of many of our forefathers, and I do sincerely rejoice that all civilized nations have united in abhorring and abolishing this detestable traffic."

This remark suggests the inquiry, why was this traffic detestable? and why have all civilized nations united in abhorring and abolishing it? The introduction of African slavery into the colonies, could be detestable only because slavery is detestable. To introduce Africans from a savage and barbarous country into a Christian land, to educate them and make them freemen and Christians, the nations would never unite in abhorring and abolishing. It would be a work of benevolence, and the worst that could be said of it would be, that it was not the best way of doing good.

Now Mr. F. should rejoice that the introduction of African slavery, and yet defend and practice the evil introduced, is a problem which it seems to us finds its only solution in the fact referred to above, viz: that *he is a master*. Poverty was another evil which our fathers introduced; it attended almost the entire population of New England during the first fifty years of its colonial history, and this was indeed a calamity. But what folly would it be in an American to cling to it, denouncing its introduction as lamentable or detestable, but maintaining that the thing itself is not to be spoken against, because, forsooth, it is not a moral evil—is recognized in the Bible? But, further, how can it be wrong to introduce an evil, and rather to continue it after its introduction? It was wrong in our first mother to introduce *sin* into the world, and all our woe. Is it not also wrong in her descendants to practise *sin*, after its introduction?

Does Mr. F. pretend to say that *sin* is not *sin*, when committed by those who are born to it as to a patrimony—that it is only a calamity? He may say it, with as much propriety as he can denounce the introduction of slavery as detestable, and call its practice only a calamity. To our Northern consciences, nothing is plainer, than that all men are created equal, and their Creator are endowed with certain inalienable rights, of which liberty is one; and that the 'English and Northern cupidity' which made the African slave, violated, in so doing, a divine and eternal law; and this we call a moral wrong. It is to our minds no less plain, that the Southern cupidity, which makes the descendants of those slaves—*slaves too*; which deprives some three millions of their personal liberty and self-propriety, which makes the blessed Bible a sealed book to them, and which every day forcibly sunders the most endearing relations in direct opposition to the laws of God, is as plain as the day.

Lord Jesus Christ, shall possess the same feeling? Then shall the day of emancipation dawn, not only emancipation from the power of the slaveholder, but emancipation from *sin*, and a world shall soon be redeemed from its power and thralldom, in all its forms.

FUNERALS.

There is no time when the influence of habit is more felt than when we are called to bury the dead. Friends, sorrowing for those they have been called to give up, shrink from taking any course which may cause remark, though their own feelings would lead them to act contrary to public opinion or common custom. Long after the propriety of a certain course is doubtful, it is adhered to with as much tenacity as would be demanded by a duty too plain to be disputed. Habits, long established, can with great difficulty and only after a series of efforts, be broken up, even when all admit that they should no longer be permitted to exist. This is true especially of customs connected with the sad scenes of a funeral. We are aware that it is a delicate matter, to interfere with the solemnities of a burial, or to find fault with the manner in which the last respects are paid to the dead, but customs obtain at funerals, in some parts of New England so manifestly unnecessary, if not improper, that we cannot forbear noticing them, in hopes of doing good.

We are glad to know that the practice of clothing one's self in black, as an outward sign of inward grief, after a hard struggle, is giving way to the dictates of common sense. That it will entirely disappear we have no doubt, if the wealthy will universally set the necessary example. Even now, those who can least afford such an outlay as the practice demands, are almost the only persons who persist in following it. The time is not far distant when it will be thought as inappropriate and unnecessary to clothe in black as an evidence of sorrow for a dead, as for a living friend. There is a sorrow which the living sometimes produce, for which we would sooner clothe ourselves in the habiliments worn as indications of mourning, than for the sorrow the dead have caused.

There is another custom which probably is nearly universal in the smaller villages of New England, the propriety or expediency of which we never could understand. We refer to the call which is made upon the pastor for a sermon at every funeral, from that of the child of a day to the man of fourscore. We have strong objections to this custom, and we think have good and sufficient reasons for protesting against it. We have no right to place a man in the position we call upon the ministers to occupy on all such occasions. The preacher is expected to give a large portion of the time, allotted for his sermon, to the character of the deceased. If he has been a Christian, there have been in his character imperfections to be avoided, as well as excellences to imitate. Those imperfections have been more obvious to, and dwelt upon by, the world, than the beauties of his character. But the preacher dare not dwell upon them, and when he speaks it is only in the language of eulogy. The impatient listener is thinking that of the imperfections while the minister is speaking of the excellences. If, on the other hand, the deceased has been of bad repute, the task of the pastor is still more difficult. To speak in the language of eulogy would be to speak falsely;—to come out with the truth would be dangerous and improper; and the great object is to run as near to falsehood as possible without being guilty of reaching it, that the feelings of friends may not be injured, nor the pastor subjected to a loss of popularity. A shrewd man may succeed in this, but a conscientious man will blush at his own time-serving cowardice, and an observing man will find that he holds upon the ungaily has thus been loosened.

But this is not the only objection to funeral sermons, though it may be the most weighty. The pastor is often expected to travel miles, on a hasty summons, that he may preach, at the funeral of one with whom he was never acquainted, and to a community which he never visited. He is often expected to travel miles, on a hasty summons, that he may preach, at the funeral of one with whom he was never acquainted, and to a community which he never visited. He is often expected to travel miles, on a hasty summons, that he may preach, at the funeral of one with whom he was never acquainted, and to a community which he never visited.

quainted, and to a community which never attends upon his ministry, nor contributes to his support. The most he can hope for is, that he shall return from his call without making enemies,—he has no more reason to expect gratitude for this labor, than for attending a prayer meeting among his own people. Thus, by those who often have no claim upon him, is a demand made upon his time, his plans are deranged, his studies interfered with, and those labors confined to a few which he is bound to bestow upon his people.

On the other hand, what benefit arises from this practice? We have yet to learn that over Stephen's body a discourse was delivered. If Peter had been requested to preach at the funeral of Annanias and Sapphira it is rather probable that the call would have remained unanswered. And why?—because his great duty was to work in the cause of Christ, and that cause would not have been advanced by an acceptance. We presume those engaged now in the same work, which engaged Peter's time, would be justified in following his example, under similar circumstances.

There are other objectionable circumstances connected with funerals which might be adverted to. Our object however is to enter a protest against preaching at such scenes, as a general custom. If there must be a sermon at either end of a man's life, we should prefer one at his birth, as presenting a better occasion for advice and instruction than a funeral discourse, and as placing a pastor in a much less embarrassing situation.

THE CONVERSION OF SINNERS.

We read in Luke 11:13: "If ye being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" And we are assured (Ps. 51:13, 14) that if we have the joys of the Spirit, sinners will be converted. Now it may be supposed that a person cannot be a Christian, who does not love the cause Christ, and desire the conversion of sinners. How, then, shall we account for the fact, that of the more than 200 churches of the Baptist denomination in this State, scarcely one is enjoying a revival of religion—is seeing sinners turning to God. Perhaps more than two thirds of the inhabitants of Massachusetts are destitute of interest in Christ. And yet, what people have the power of using better means, for the salvation of souls, than have Christians in this State? My heart is sad when I think of Christian ministers, even living for years without so teaching transgressors the ways of the Lord, as to witness, through their instrumentality, the conversion of a single soul. I have but little hope of the conversion of the world, while Christians have so little interest in the conversion of sinners at home; while they see, unaffected, their friends perishing in their sin; yes, encourage them onward, in the road to death.

Is it true that the heathen must have the light of the gospel in order to be saved? That is not all they must have. Their eyes must be opened, and that, too, through the instrumentality of the church. Now if we have not power enough with God, enough of his Spirit, enough of faith to prevail with him to open the eyes of those with whom we associate to see the light shining upon them, what hope can we have that many in a heathen land will be made to behold the true light, though it should shine brightly there? Certainly very little, unless it be by the efforts and prayers of persons of stronger faith, and more under the influence of the Spirit of God, than ourselves. Christians must feel more and do more for sinners at home, and then will their influence be more powerfully felt in distant lands. It is that Christian who labors and prays for the salvation of an impenitent acquaintance, whose prayers may be heard for an impenitent heathen. But that church which looks with indifference upon sinners in its own sanctuary, does but mock God, when it prays for the conversion of the world.

For the encouragement of those who prefer the prayer-meeting to the social party, and who had rather labor in the service of Christ than to spend their time amidst scenes of worldly pleasure, I will give one or two sketches of what I have known the Spirit to do in the way of converting sinners. I may hereafter give a few more facts, showing the efficacy of prayer when accompanied with faith and works in bringing sinners to repentance.

A REVIVAL SKETCH.

The pastor of the church, with which some in a neighborhood of a few miles distant were connected, concluded to preach on a certain Sabbath in that neighborhood, leaving his own people in the village in charge with another minister. There was nothing particularly noticeable during either service, save the lightness apparent at times among the youth of the congregation. The pastor remained on Monday in the place, visiting from house to house, and preaching again in the evening. On Tuesday morning he left, but with the conviction on his own mind that God was about to work there.

A licensee, at his request, spent several days and the following Sabbath in that place, visiting, praying, and preaching. On the next Monday the pastor felt a strong conviction that he ought to visit the very neighborhood again, so strong that he overcame some obstacles that seemed almost insuperable, and went. He met on his way the licensee, by whom he was assured that no signs of a revival were there apparent. An appointment, however, was given for a meeting in the evening. With much embarrassment and difficulty a sermon was attempted to be preached. The congregation appeared very sleepy. The meeting was about to be closed when the pastor unaccountably to himself, said that, if there were any present who desired to be remembered specially in the prayers of God's people, they would please manifest it by rising. No one rose. But the influence of the Spirit seemed to be at once felt. A few remarks were made by the pastor, and the meeting dismissed. The whole assembly, however, dropped upon their seats. Immediately after a student from a college not far distant, whose parents lived in the neighborhood, rose in the assembly, and with deep feeling, uttered the striking words, "I am going to hell!" He desired to be prayed for, and asked his young associates to join with him in the request. It was like an electric shock. The congregation was thrilled. Several of them went around. A number of youth rose for prayers. Christians fell down before God, confessed their sins, and prayed. The meeting continued until a late hour at night, and when it closed, the people separated with reluctant hearts. The work went on with great power, until a large number of the people in that community were hopelessly converted to God. In some instances bitter opponents, who attended meeting to scoff, went home to pray. That revival was evidently the work of God's

Spirit in answer to prayer, and it is probable in answer to the prayers of a sister in the church, who, though little known, had for weeks wept and prayed over the wickedness of the place, until she seemed to see clearly in prospect, and spoke frequently of the revival that actually took place. Now it may appear in eternity, that that obscure female did more for the welfare of our country, even than some distinguished men, who have been greatly praised for their patriotism. This revival was produced instrumentally by prayer, faith, and works.

ANOTHER SKETCH.

A certain pastor and two of his church met one morning, and soon the inquiry was made, "What can be done to promote the cause of Christ among us?" It was suggested, among other things, that an effort be made to ascertain how many of the society indulged a hope. It was found on inquiry that more than thirty of the congregation belonged to this class. Most of them were influenced to meet with others and give a reason of their hope. Various means were used to improve the religious state of things in the place, but without success. One Sabbath came, and another, but no change for the better appeared. At length a Sabbath came, the forenoon service passed, and the prospect of a revival looked darker than ever. The afternoon service passed, and the darkness was only increased. The pastor was so much discouraged that he omitted to give out the usual third service, and suggested that they hold another devotion, who held one in the village, of rather peculiar character, and over he met at the foot of the pulpit stairs, or three of the brethren, who said that "they felt just like praying to God for the influences of his Spirit, and with considerable emotion, added, 'we want a prayer-meeting some where to-night.' It was evident that they saw whence help must come, and felt that they must have that help. Increased discouragement was producing its proper effect on their mind—was driving them to lay stronger hold on God, as did Jacob. It was agreed that the bell should strike as usual for the prayer-meeting. For some cause it struck several minutes past the hour, and after most of the meeting-going people were assembled at other places of worship. But it struck at the right time to secure the attendance of a young lady who was passing at the moment the place of worship, to visit a friend. As she was by the door, and unobserved, her curiosity led her to step in, and see what a conference meeting was, as she had never attended one. Ten other persons assembled. It was soon manifest in the very deep desire. Every heart was affected. The backslider was reclaimed. The young lady mentioned above was deeply convicted, and soon after converted. Christians confessed and wept and prayed, and when they separated they had faith, felt strong—felt that one could chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight. The next day some were seen visiting from house to house, teaching transgressors the ways of the Lord. Soon sinners were converted. Scores in a short time were brought to rejoice in hope.

In conclusion, let me inquire of Christian friends, do you desire to see sinners converted? Our profession answers in the affirmative; but what does our practice say? We must admit that if sinners are not converted by our instrumentality, then the Holy Spirit is not with us, upholding, rejoicing us, and if we have not the Spirit, then we do not seek for it, do not desire it. And if we do not desire it, then—will you fill up the blank? A Christian not desire the Spirit, a patriot not love his country—can it be?

P. R.

'ANTIOCH'—FAITH—INFLUENCES OF THE SPIRIT.

Mr. EDITOR,—I have been reading 'Antioch, or the Increase of Moral Power in the Church,' by Phares Church, of Rochester, New York. Some parts of this work are very excellent, but other portions, in the opinion of the writer, are unscriptural.

The objectionable part to which your attention is called in this communication, is, what is said on faith and the influences of the Spirit, in the chapter on the 'injurious influence of uninspired dogmas.' The author asserts that in regeneration, faith in the gospel precedes the sanctifying influence of the Spirit upon the heart. After arguing the matter at some length, he says,—"That the Spirit should do his work before the truth of the gospel has brought the man to surrender himself to it, in an act of trust or belief, not only contradicts the Bible, but the experience of every truly converted person."

That the views of the author are not misrepresented is further evident from the following quotation:—"And besides, if faith is impossible to a sinner, till the Spirit has wrought a change in his involuntary affections, why should his unbelief be treated as so serious a crime?"

With all due respect for brother Church, whose abilities are deservedly acknowledged, I must be permitted to deny, that the sinner exercises faith or trust in the gospel before the Spirit operates upon his heart, in his sanctifying influences.

The Bible says—"To one is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, by the same Spirit. To another faith by the same Spirit—God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." These texts, as well as others that might be furnished, prove that faith is not a product of the carnal heart, but of one renewed by the operations of the Holy Spirit.

That faith does not precede the saving influences of the Spirit, may be further argued from the moral condition of the carnal heart, and from the character of the affections involved in the faith of the gospel. The Bible represents the carnal mind as being subject to law, and as not being subject to his law. It likewise teaches that the heart is accursed above all things and desperately wicked. Consequently, the carnal heart is wholly disqualified, by its great depravity, to meet of itself any of the requirements of the gospel, whether in thought, word, or deed. If faith in the gospel involves just what faith in profane history does, and no more, then, indeed, might the sinner believe the gospel before realizing the sanctifying influences of the Spirit on his heart. But the faith of the gospel does involve more. It involves a confidence in Christ, that human depravity utterly disqualifies the unregenerate mind for believing.

Again: the Bible uniformly represents the carnal heart, at every stage of its career, as being in a state of rebellion, and as possessing all the characteristics of the Christian. Hence, if a sinner may be a real believer before the Spirit operates upon his heart, as brother Church contends, he may be in a state of salvation before realizing the sanctifying in-

fluences of the Spirit, and he may, consequently, be in a state of salvation before he is born of the Spirit! But what can be more absurd than the teaching of the Bible? A sinner, therefore, is not a true believer before the Spirit has effected a sanctifying influence upon his heart.

For a sinner to exercise true faith in the gospel before realizing the sanctifying power of the Spirit, being so contrary to the whole tenor of divine revelation, I could not believe that the book alluded to, did advocate this doctrine, until I had read the chapter in which it is contained, several times. If brother Church believes, (but I presume he does not,) that a sinner may be a true believer of the gospel, and yet not a real believer in Christ, he makes a distinction not warranted by the word of God. If the writer is not under a wrong impression, the greatest degree of faith in the gospel is inseparable from the highest attainments in moral excellence; and it is the mightiest work of the Spirit on the heart, that brings the sinner to throw himself unreservedly upon the sovereign mercy of God in Christ, as this surrender involves a radical change in the sinner's moral nature.

But the objector may say, if, in regeneration, faith does not precede the operations of the Spirit, the latter must precede the former, and consequently, a sinner may be renewed by the Spirit, and still be an unbeliever. It is readily granted that no such doctrine can be maintained by the Scriptures. But I deny that, because, in regeneration, faith does not precede the operations of the Spirit, therefore the influence of the Spirit on the heart must precede faith, and, consequently, that a sinner may be renewed by the Spirit, and still be an unbeliever! The fact is, there is no true faith without the operations of the Spirit, and no sanctifying operations of the Spirit without true faith. And, admitting one of these, in its effects in regeneration, may precede the other in the order of time, they are inseparable.

In concluding his argument, the author exclaims—"What a man damned for not believing the gospel, when the thing was impossible to him! He might be damned for acting against the light of nature, or against the dictates of natural conscience, but not for the lack of an exercising the power to which the Spirit had not furnished him! All this would be true, if the sinner's disability to believe the gospel were of the same nature as the blind man's to see the sun, or of the child's to put forth the strength of a man. But such is not the nature of the sinner's disability to believe the gospel. His disability for believing the gospel is precisely of the nature of that which disqualifies him for loving his Creator. But will brother Church say that the sinner ought not to be damned for hating God, which he will do forever, if the Holy Spirit change his heart? Why then exclaim against the sinner's condemnation for not believing the gospel?"

In conclusion, permit me to say, that I have not assumed a controversial attitude merely for the sake of controversy, but to show that the positions asserted are unscriptural, and consequently, dangerous. Some I am, if the doctrines disputed were the doctrines of the Bible, none would more readily embrace them than the writer.

PAUL.

JULY 23d, 1844.

A SERMON AT SARATOGA.

Saratoga Springs, July 22, 1844.

MY DEAR BROTHERS,—Yesterday morning I was one of a large, attentive audience who listened with unusual delight to a discourse such as is seldom heard at this or any other 'meeting place.' The preacher was the President of Brown University, who has been called here by the extreme illness of his brother-in-law, Col. William L. Stone, one of the editors of the New York Commercial Advertiser. The sermon, as he afterwards told me, consisted of the substance of two lectures which he had delivered to his students; and truly it was substance of no ordinary value. It is always a rare privilege to hear Dr. Wayland, for he makes me think, and feeds my spiritual nature with the provision that refreshes and invigorates. But I never heard him with so much pleasure as yesterday. I will not attempt even a sketch of his discourse, lest I shall do him injustice; but I can assure you that it was a superlative production, with not one feeble sentence, not one puny or commonplace conception. His argument was lucid and compact as rock crystal; his illustrations were all select and felicitous. I have read and re-read every thing that he has published; but I know of nothing from his pen that surpasses, in unity, clearness and strength, the sun-like production with which he yesterday instructed and impressed an intelligent congregation. A volume of such lectures would be a golden contribution to our religious literature, to theological science. If the sermon lacked any thing, it was application—a very common want of modern pulpit efforts.

Several practical inferences occurred to my own mind, with which I was anxious to have him press his hearers, upon whom it was easy to see that he had fixed the graspings of his logic; and I felt disappointed when I found that, having carried the outskirts of the understanding, he struck but one faint blow at the citadel of the moral powers. He thus lost an opportunity to do uncommon execution. What though he had spent nearly an hour in his argument? Jonathan Edwards would have spent at least half as much more time in driving the truth, which he had elaborated, through the intellect, and through the conscience, and riveting them on the other side. When a preacher has said nothing that is applicable, I can pardon him for omitting all application. But when he has, like Peter, testified, 'I want him, like Peter, to exhort,' at least saying, 'Save yourselves from this untoward generation.'

From this omission, which in a college lecturer may be more pardonable than in a pastor, there was nothing to be desired. As I listened, I had two thoughts:

1. What occasion we have for gratitude that we have such a mind at the head of our beloved University—a mind whose power of generalization is not surpassed, if it is equalled, in the present age. It is delightful to think that under the influence of such a mind so many young ministers are trained up for enlarged usefulness.

2. How weighty the responsibilities of those who enjoy the instructions of such a teacher! Could I address them, I would say, By all means, avail yourselves to the utmost of your extraordinary privileges. Lose no opportunity of hearing the lectures, the sermons, the Bible-classes of instruction of such a master. Learn of him to think, to analyze, to classify. Stretch yourselves, young gentlemen, and be not content with the puny measure of your fourth-rate contemporaries.

THE METHODIST CHURCH IN THE SOUTH.

The Southern papers come teeming with the action of Methodist churches and Conferences relative to the late action of the General Conference, and the proposed division of that body, which is now inevitable. More than a page of the Southern Christian Advocate, in each of its last two numbers, is filled with the proceedings of meetings. Zion's Herald, published in this city, gives a condensed report of many of these, and uses the following language:—"We attempted to give an outline of the proceedings of Southern Methodist churches since the General Conference, but after consulting our present list, gave up in despair. They are too numerous for our columns; and their tone is the same every where. We speak literally when we say that more extravagance was never exhibited in any assemblies of American Christians. The reader may judge after reading the specimens given this week, and they are not the worst. Our good brother of the Southern Christian Advocate, cannot claim himself. Any cool-headed physician, reading his editorial, would, we think, pronounce him in imminent danger of insanity. He must excuse us if we cannot stop to reply to his furious attacks on the North and ourselves."

At a meeting held at Milledgeville, resolutions were adopted expressive of sympathy and admiration for Bishop Andrew and Sturge; also one in favor of an immediate separation of the church. Another resolution passed by the same meeting, we copy.

Resolved, That we cordially approve of the conduct of the delegates to the General Conference from the slaveholding States, in resisting of Bishop Andrew and the constitution of the church, and to him we tender a hearty welcome whenever his convenience will permit him to come among us.

Resolved, That we are much pleased with the plan proposed of calling a convention of ministers to meet next May in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of the organization of a Southern church.

Resolved, That we will now and for ever insist upon a separate organization, unless action upon slavery is prohibited by constitutional law.

At a meeting held at Milledgeville, resolutions were adopted expressive of sympathy and admiration for Bishop Andrew and Sturge; also one in favor of an immediate separation of the church. Another resolution passed by the same meeting, we copy.

Of one thing, my dear brother, I am very certain. If we have not a strong pulpit, the fault does not belong to the President of Brown University. With the materials furnished to his hand, I believe he does his utmost to give them form and pressure suited to the exigencies of our age.

THE METHODIST CHURCH IN THE SOUTH.

The Southern papers come teeming with the action of Methodist churches and Conferences relative to the late action of the General Conference, and the proposed division of that body, which is now inevitable. More than a page of the Southern Christian Advocate, in each of its last two numbers, is filled with the proceedings of meetings. Zion's Herald, published in this city, gives a condensed report of many of these, and uses the following language:—"We attempted to give an outline of the proceedings of Southern Methodist churches since the General Conference, but after consulting our present list, gave up in despair. They are too numerous for our columns; and their tone is the same every where. We speak literally when we say that more extravagance was never exhibited in any assemblies of American Christians. The reader may judge after reading the specimens given this week, and they are not the worst. Our good brother of the Southern Christian Advocate, cannot claim himself. Any cool-headed physician, reading his editorial, would, we think, pronounce him in imminent danger of insanity. He must excuse us if we cannot stop to reply to his furious attacks on the North and ourselves."

At a meeting held at Milledgeville, resolutions were adopted expressive of sympathy and admiration for Bishop Andrew and Sturge; also one in favor of an immediate separation of the church. Another resolution passed by the same meeting, we copy.

Resolved, That we cordially approve of the conduct of the delegates to the General Conference from the slaveholding States, in resisting of Bishop Andrew and the constitution of the church, and to him we tender a hearty welcome whenever his convenience will permit him to come among us.

Resolved, That we are much pleased with the plan proposed of calling a convention of ministers to meet next May in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of the organization of a Southern church.

Resolved, That we will now and for ever insist upon a separate organization, unless action upon slavery is prohibited by constitutional law.

At a meeting held at Milledgeville, resolutions were adopted expressive of sympathy and admiration for Bishop Andrew and Sturge; also one in favor of an immediate separation of the church. Another resolution passed by the same meeting, we copy.

Resolved, That we cordially approve of the conduct of the delegates to the General Conference from the slaveholding States, in resisting of Bishop Andrew and the constitution of the church, and to him we tender a hearty welcome whenever his convenience will permit him to come among us.

Resolved, That we are much pleased with the plan proposed of calling a convention of ministers to meet next May in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of the organization of a Southern church.

Resolved, That we will now and for ever insist upon a separate organization, unless action upon slavery is prohibited by constitutional law.

At a meeting held at Milledgeville, resolutions were adopted expressive of sympathy and admiration for Bishop Andrew and Sturge; also one in favor of an immediate separation of the church. Another resolution passed by the same meeting, we copy.

Resolved, That we cordially approve of the conduct of the delegates to the General Conference from the slaveholding States, in resisting of Bishop Andrew and the constitution of the church, and to him we tender a hearty welcome whenever his convenience will permit him to come among us.

Resolved, That we are much pleased with the plan proposed of calling a convention of ministers to meet next May in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of the organization of a Southern church.

Resolved, That we will now and for ever insist upon a separate organization, unless action upon slavery is prohibited by constitutional law.

At a meeting held at Milledgeville, resolutions were adopted expressive of sympathy and admiration for Bishop Andrew and Sturge; also one in favor of an immediate separation of the church. Another resolution passed by the same meeting, we copy.

Resolved, That we cordially approve of the conduct of the delegates to the General Conference from the slaveholding States, in resisting of Bishop Andrew and the constitution of the church, and to him we tender a hearty welcome whenever his convenience will permit him to come among us.

Resolved, That we are much pleased with the plan proposed of calling a convention of ministers to meet next May in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of the organization of a Southern church.

Resolved, That we will now and for ever insist upon a separate organization, unless action upon slavery is prohibited by constitutional law.

rights for the different towns in the State for sale on
favorable terms.
Apply to the Stove and Hot Air Furnace Factory and
Ice Room, 51 & 53 Blackstone street.

